



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/866,346	05/24/2001	Jean-Michel Decombe	4418P002	4839
8791	7590 03/11/2004		EXAMINER	
·	' SOKOLOFF TAYLOR SHIRE BOULEVARD, SE	LUU, MATTHEW		
	LES, CA 90025	, Elviii Edok	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2672 DATE MAIL ED: 03/11/2000	\$

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

PM

Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		09/866,346	DECOMBE, JEAN-MICHEL			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		LUU MATTHEW	2672			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failt Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timy within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>25 November 2002</u> .					
2a)□	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This action is non-final.					
3)[	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or					
Applicat	ion Papers					
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the to drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority i	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12)□ a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents  2. Certified copies of the priority documents  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents  application from the International Bureau  See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachmer	ut(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  2) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
3) 🛛 Infor	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date <u>4-7</u> .		atent Application (PTO-152)			

Application/Control Number: 09/866,346

Art Unit: 2672

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nitahara (6,604,108) in view of Weinberg et al (6,237,006).

Regarding claim 1, Nitahara discloses (Figs. 1-4, 9 and 14) a method comprising: displaying hierarchical and relational information in a graph (Figs. 9 and 14); receiving user input for selecting a subject of interest; and changing the display of hierarchical and relational information in response to the selection. See column 3, lines 1-4; column 5, lines 43-62; column 8, lines 19-32; column 8, line 62 to column 9, line 13; and column 9, lines 55-62.

The only difference between the claimed invention and the disclosure of Nitahara is that the claim requires "a graph of node" form.

However, Weinberg et al (6,237,006) from the same field of endeavor disclose (Figs. 1-6) information is displayed in a graph of node form. It is obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the graph of node displaying method of Weinberg et al in the hierarchical and relational information in a graph form of Nitahara to provide a compact layout of hierarchical tree and relational information in a graphical node form

Application/Control Number: 09/866,346

Art Unit: 2672

which greatly facilitates the visualization of the user in navigating the hierarchical tree map in a more efficient and intuitive manner.

Regarding claim 2, Weinberg et al teaches (Figs. 1-6) different nodes in a hierarchical tree graph can be selected for zooming in/out or manipulated. Furthermore, this is conventional in the art.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nitahara (6,604,108) in view of Weinberg et al (6,237,006) as applied to claims 1-2 above, and further in view of Robertson et al (5,295,243).

The only difference between the claimed invention and the disclosure of Nitahara in view of Weinberg et al is that the claim 3 requires "animation".

However, Robertson et al disclose a display system for displaying hierarchical three-dimensional structures with "animation" effects. See column 13, lines 58-60; and column 16, lines 57-63. It is obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art to use the "animation" effects in a hierarchical display system of Robertson et al into the hierarchal and relation information display system Nitahara to provide more visualization effects for a user.

## Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

-Prompt et al (US 2001/0034733 A1) disclose a system and method for providing access to databases via directories and other hierarchical structures and interfaces.

Art Unit: 2672

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LUU MATTHEW whose telephone number is (703) 305-4850. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 hrs.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, RAZAVI MICHAEL can be reached on (703) 305-4713. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M. Luu

MATTHEW LUU PRIMARY EXAMINER

Dele a